Minutes from December 8, 2004
CBS Bureau Communication/Scheduling Meeting

Attendees: NIST: Wendy Wiles, Sarah Tuohy Eileen Stammler and Scott Montgomery
NOAA: Steven Brunvoll and Bill Holdsworth
EDA: Ghee Tara
Census: Avis Merkl
CSC: Amy Sommerville, Patricia Jackson (facilitator), Sue Masser,
Lillian Yeh, Kesha Pendergrast, and Lynn Goodrich

Date/Time: December 8, 2004, 10 am to noon

Purpose: User Communication and Scheduling Discussion

Major Topics discussed are summarized below:

1. CBS Master Communication/Scheduling Plan

    a. **Status of the 2005 Initiatives and Continuing projects -** The status of the 2005
    Initiatives and continuing projects were discussed. See Attachment 1.a Part 1 CSC
    Project Status as of Dec 8, 2004 and Attachment 1.a Part 2. CBS Master Scheduling Plan
    to Include Bureau Implementation. These attachments are being provided after the
    meeting to document the discussions.

    b. **Status of Bureau code in Production and Concept of Contractual Rework Period** -
    Patricia facilitated a discussion on the status of the Bureaus production code in an effort
    to discuss what version of code Bureaus should have implemented in production and the
    concept of providing AR reworks within the contractual rework period. The contractual
    rework period was defined as the amount of time that was reasonable for all reworks to
    be identified that applied to an AR. As during this period the firm fixed price cited for
    the AR would still cover the cost of fixing the rework. After this contractual rework
    period has expired, reworks identified would be fixed using additional units with another
    firm fixed price quote. It was explained that this discussion was to solicit the Bureaus
    views in an effort to help the CSC and Systalex determine the length of time for the
    contractual rework period.

    Attachment 1.b. Draft Discussion Document, CBS Deliveries and the Applications
    Impacted, Prepared for Version Support Discussion Purposes Only was provided to help
    facilitate the discussion. This document listed all of the deliveries, a proposed date by
    which the bureaus should have implemented the code into production, and a proposed
    contractual date by which the contractual rework period would end, the modules
    impacted, and the applications impacted. The applications impacted columns also reflect
    the version of the Bureaus production environments for CFS, DW, CPCS, and CRS.
    While there is only one official version numbering scheme as all deliveries do not impact

all of the applications, applications status is often defined by the last version that impacted the application. The following approach was discussed:

Proposed code implementation and rework identification approach:

	In Production:	Contractual Reworks Period ends:
Level 1 AR	At the end of the 1st month after delivery	At the end of the 2nd month after delivery
Maintenance Deliveries	At the end of the 2nd month after delivery	At the end of the 3rd Month after delivery
Medium Projects	At the end of the 2nd month after delivery	At the end of the 3rd Month after delivery
Major Projects	Will be agreed upon by CSC/Bureaus during the project planning phase.	

(Note: Schedule must incorporate impact of production schedule for the previous medium/major delivery)

The bureaus indicated that the proposed approach for level 1s would not work as each Bureau with the exception of EDA cited that while they test and promote the critical levels 1s (which is usually the level ones that they create) right away but the other could not be implemented until their scheduled every- six-weeks migration of code. Patricia questioned if the Bureaus felt that the time allowed to move code for the maintenance into delivery was too long. The Bureaus indicated that it was appropriate due to their time limitations as to when they can promote code into production. Those timeframe are defined in Attachment 1.b. Patricia indicated that the contractual rework concept was also going to be discussed at the CBS managers meeting on 12/9/04 and that CSC would take the Bureaus input and work with Systalex to which an agreement.

2.   AR Process and Status

 A. CSC Status of ARs, Maintenance, Major Projects

   a. **Current status of ARs** – Attachments 2.A.a. Status of Level 1 ARs as of 12/07/04 was distributed to communicate the status of the 15 current level 1 ARs.

   b. **ARs delivered in November** - Attachment 2.A.b. Level 1 Activity for November 2004 was distributed to show that 23 ARs were delivered or closed unchanged during the month of November.

   c. **December 15 Maintenance Release** – Patricia indicated that the proposed release will include 10 CFS ARs and 15 CPCS ARs. A list of 10 ARs that could not be worked on, as the CFS code is locked due to the CCR and CSTARS efforts. The fact that certain ARs for various reasons were not delivered was also discussed. The reasons included the fact that code was locked for CCR, the number of level 1 ARs being worked on, Bureaus re-prioritizing of the level 2, request for additional information from the Bureaus, and SSD need to provide more analysis. Specifically some of the CPCS ARs are not being provided due to plans to use the Accounts Payable Standard Interface for some of the functional changes requested. In addition, the Funds Control project would encompass the default funds control feature. Patricia indicated that the CSC was working on the sub-committee approach for the maintenance release and being able to maintain data so that they can provide explanations as to why certain priority ARs did not make the delivery. In addition, Patricia indicated that the CSC is working toward moving the planning process up so that more advance planning could hopefully assist the communication

effort. Amy Sommerville offered that when AR communication is provided to the Bureaus, it is provided typically sent to the contracts on the ARs and she would start including the Communication Committee member and identify that this is a priority level 2 AR. Amy also communicated that ARs that are started in a previous period but are not completed in time for the delivery are sometimes completed and delivered in the next cycle even thou the priority may have been downgraded by the Bureaus.

Bureaus Need for the CSC to support multiple versions of code - In discussing the February Maintenance Delivery, it was noted that ARs that included code impacted by CCR could need to be coded for multiple versions of the code if CCR was not promoted into production timely. The CSC agreed to evaluate the ARs requested for the February maintenance and identify those that would be impacted by the CCR code as one option would also be to omit those ARs. The Bureaus indicated that as it would take them some time (dates could not be provided) to test and migrate CCR into production, in the interim they would need level 1 delivered for their current production environment as well as on top of the CCR version of code. NIST indicated that their implementation of CCR would probably be even later than the other Bureaus as they currently have a version of CSTARS implemented they in the interim they would also need for the CSC to support multiple versions of the code.

B. CSC Level 1 AR Process

a. **Implementation of Level 1 Notification** - The Bureaus request to have Level 1 ARs be e-mailed to the Committee members so that they could be informed and provide workarounds or other input will also be implemented.

b. **Review AR Form** - Bureaus were asked to evaluate the AR form and provide recommendations for improvement. This discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

c. **New AR Report** - Patricia indicated that the changes to the AR reports would be implemented as cited in the e-mail sent by Amy Sommerville.

d. **More Critical View of Level ARs** – Patricia indicated that the CSC was planning to redefine the definition of level 1. The criteria that it was in the production environment would be expanded to indicate that it was significantly impacting production and that any work around was too labor intensive to implement.

C. CSC Standard Maintenance Process

a. **GUI Standards** – Patricia indicated that the CSC was evaluating an approach of making the new GUI standard changes with Level 2 Maintenance AR's. Doing this will require additional programming time for level 2 AR's beginning with AR's for February 2005 maintenance release. All of the bureaus (NOAA, NIST, EDA, and Census) agreed that they would prefer that the GUI standards are incorporated when the programmers are making the level 2 fixes. The Bureaus commented that the administrative/testing savings would offset some of the additional programming time

and agreed that this would be more efficient. A final decision on the approach is still pending.

D. TAC Process

Patricia explained that one of the comments received requested that the CSC hold regular TAC meeting versus using the e-mail for TAC approval. Patricia responded that the approach was to use the e-mail for simple, straight forward ARs and that a meeting would be call to handle ARs that were complex. The Bureaus agreed that this approach we should continue with this approach.

Action items:

Description	Responsibility	Target Date
Action Items from Nov 9 meeting		
1. Provide electronic version of handouts from kickoff meeting.	CSC	Completed Nov 9th
2. Provided Feedback as to whether the 2nd Wednesday is appropriate for the regular meeting time.	Bureaus/CSC	Completed Nov 19th
3. Provide Contact Names for the TAC Process.	CSC	Completed Nov 19th
4. Communicate Revised Delivery Date for CCR.	CSC	Completed – December 8
5. Evaluate AR form and provide recommendations for improvement.	Bureaus	Next Meeting –January 12
6. Provide update on major initiatives, user feedback and concerns	Bureaus	Next Meeting – January 12
7. Distribute level 1 e-mails to Committee as they arrive at CSC	CSC	Completed Approach Implementation in process
8. Determine CSC Supported Code Version, Yellow and Red Code Version	Bureaus/CSC	Completed discussion - Linked to Contractual Rework Concept – CSC will communicate final decision
9. Modify report distribution POC's	CSC	Completed – Implementation in process
10. Decide on best alternative to provide bureaus with comprehensive AR report sorted by module and number.		
11. An e-mail communicating the report changes will be sent to the individuals receiving the reports.		
12. Organize subcommittee for level 2 AR's	Bureaus/CSC	TBD
13. Organize and participate in a review of the AR form	Bureaus/CSC	Next Meeting – January 12
14. CSC Daily/Weekly Contact with Bureaus	CSC	On-going

15. Communication Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD
16. CBS Master Scheduling Plan	CSC/Bureaus	TBD
Action Items from Dec 8 meeting		
17. Related to the Sub-committee approach being evaluated to discuss the maintenance delivery, the CSC will provide track/maintain and provide explanations as to why certain priority ARs do not make the maintenance delivery. In addition the CSC will copy Committee members on AR issues sent to the AR contacts.	CSC	E-mail Copy – Will be implemented immediately.\
\
Track/maintain and provide explanations - TBD
18. CSC will define which ARs requested in the Feb Maintenance Release is impacted by the CCR changes.	CSC	TBD
19. NOAA is to provide dates and explanations as to issues relating to not promoting CRS and CPCS code.	NOAA	
20. Census is to provide dates and identify any issues relating to promoting CRS, DW, and CPCS	Census	DW and CPCS information provided 12/8/04, Still need CRS input
21. Send handouts from the Trial Meeting	CSC	12/10/04